

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. *Gilchrest*) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. *Rahall*) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5946, the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 2006. I want to thank Senator *Stevens* and Senator *Inouye* for their hard work in getting this authorization to the Senate and to the House. I also want to thank Chairman **RICHARD POMBO**, who has been a champion for the recreational and commercial fishermen of this Nation. We will miss his leadership greatly. And I want to thank and support all the other Members and their staff that have been involved in this process.

At this point I will insert in the **RECORD** an exchange of letters between Chairman *Pombo* and Chairman *Boehlert* regarding this bill and between Chairman *Pombo* and Chairman *Thomas* regarding the polar bear provisions contained in title IX, originally part of H.R. 4075.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES,

Washington, DC, July 13, 2006.
Hon. **WILLIAM M. THOMAS**,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I ask your cooperation to help schedule consideration by the House of Representatives of H.R. 4075, the Marine Mammal Protection Act Amendments of 2006, during the week of July 17-21, 2006. I have proposed an amendment to this bill which includes text from S.

2013, the United States-Russia Polar Bear Conservation and Management Act of 2005. The Committee on Ways and Means has a jurisdictional interest in this Senate bill because of its inclusion of trade measures.

My staff has worked with yours to develop a mutually-agreed on text for this amendment, and I have enclosed this amendment for your review. I ask that you not seek a referral of H.R. 4075 based on the inclusion of this language to expedite Floor scheduling. Of course, this action would not be considered as waiving or affecting your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the amendment, nor as precedent for any future referrals of similar measures. Moreover, if the bill is conferenced with the Senate, I would support naming Ways and Means Committee members to the conference committee for the trade provisions. I would also be pleased to include this letter and your response in the Congressional Record during consideration of the bill on the Floor.

Mr. Chairman, I have been very pleased with the tremendous degree of cooperation between our two Committees. Your staff, especially Angela Ellard and Steven Schrage, has been responsive and thoughtful, and my staff very much appreciates their support and teamwork. I hope that you will give my request serious consideration and I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Richard W. Pombo,
Chairman.

--

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, July 13, 2006.
Hon. **RICHARD W. POMBO**,
Chairman, Committee on Resources, Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN POMBO: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4075, the ``Marine Mammal Protection Act Amendments of 2006," which is scheduled for floor consideration during the week of July 17th.

As you noted, the Committee on Ways and Means maintains jurisdiction over trade measures. H.R. 4075, as amended, includes text which falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. However, in order to expedite this bill for floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice

the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future.

I appreciate your cooperation in this matter and agree to your offer to include this exchange of letters in the Congressional Record during floor consideration.

Best regards,

Bill Thomas,
Chairman.

--

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE,

Washington, DC, December 7, 2006.
Hon. **RICHARD W. POMBO**,
Chairman, Committee on Resources, Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing regarding the jurisdictional interest of the Science Committee in H.R. 5946 as amended by the Senate, the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Reauthorization Act of 2006. The Science Committee has primary jurisdiction over Title VIII, Tsunami Warning and Education, the text of which is identical to H.R. 1674, the Tsunami Warning and Education Act, as passed by the House on December 6, 2006. In addition, the Science Committee has jurisdiction over Section 211, Deep Sea Coral Research and Technology Program, and Section 701, Study of the Acidification of the Oceans and Effect on Fisheries. Sections 211 and 701 both involve ``marine research'' that is clearly within the jurisdiction of the Science Committee. The study required by Section 701 also involves ``environmental research and development'' within the jurisdiction of the Science Committee.

The Science Committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 5946 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, I will not stand in the way of floor consideration. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to allow the bill to come to the floor waives, reduces or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Science Committee, and that a copy of this letter and your letter in response will be included in the Congressional Record when the bill is considered on the House Floor.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Sherwood Boehlert,
Chairman.

--

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES,

Washington, DC, December 7, 2006.
Hon. **SHERWOOD BOEHLERT**,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for agreeing to allow the Senate amendments to H.R. 5946, to authorize appropriations to the Secretary of Commerce for the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act for fiscal years 2007 through 2013, to be considered by the House of Representatives. I concur in your assessment that the Committee on Science would have primary jurisdiction over Title VIII of the Senate amendments, as this is the text of your bill, H.R. 1674, the United States Tsunami Warning and Education Act, referred exclusively to the Committee on Science. I also concur that the Committee on Science would have a jurisdictional interest in section 211, the deep sea coral research and technology program, as well as section 701, study of the acidification of the oceans and its effect on fisheries.

By allowing this bill to be scheduled, I agree that the Committee on Science has not waived its jurisdiction over the measures included in H.R. 5946, nor should this action be taken as precedent for other bills. I would be pleased to include this letter and your December 7, 2006, letter on H.R. 5946 in the Congressional Record during debate on the bill.

Thank you again for your cooperation on this matter, and I look forward to seeing H.R. 5946 enacted soon.

Sincerely,

Richard W. Pombo,
Chairman.

I also want to thank Chairman **HENRY HYDE** of the International Relations Committee for agreeing to waive jurisdiction on the polar bear provisions. I also appreciate the cooperation of Chairman *King* of Homeland Security and Chairman *Barton* of the Energy and Commerce Committee in helping to clear this bill.

Finally, on behalf of Chairman *Pombo* and myself and former Chairman *Don Young*, I want to thank Dave Whaley, Bonnie Bruce, two committee members on the Resources Committee who worked tirelessly on this bill for many years. Without their expertise and persistence, we would not be here today. I would also like to thank my personal staff, Edith Thompson, for her work on this bill.

I urge an "aye" vote on H.R. 5946.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. RAHALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, the pending measure, as passed by the Senate, may be one of the last items on our schedule this Congress, but it is certainly not the least important. The bill would reauthorize the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act in order to guide the management of our marine fisheries through 2013. We would not be here today if Senator **TED STEVENS** and **DANIEL INOUE** had not extended an olive branch. I am extremely appreciative of the hard work that they and their staff put into this legislation. I also commend our colleague on this side of the aisle, **TOM ALLEN** from Maine, who worked tirelessly on behalf of the fishermen in his district to improve this legislation. And while the pending measure does not do everything I would have liked, it does not roll back the conservation principles in this important fisheries management law. The legislation actually strengthens the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

I support the bill. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank **JIM SAXTON** from New Jersey for his work on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the Resources Committee, **RICHARD POMBO**.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

And I will be brief. I do want to again thank all of those who have worked so hard on this bill for so long. I especially want to thank the ranking member of the committee, Mr. *Rahall*, who has worked with me not only on this legislation but so many pieces of legislation over the last 4 years and

gave us the opportunity to do some real good things on the Resources Committee.

I know that as this bill was introduced originally, **BARNEY FRANK** from Massachusetts was an original sponsor on it. We did a hearing up in his district and listened to the concerns of a lot of the fishermen in the communities that are impacted by this law. Unfortunately, all of the things that we originally set out to take care of are not included in this bill, but where we end up on this, I believe it is a bill that is better than current law. It is a stronger bill. It is something that addresses many of the issues that have been raised over the last several years in hearings and meetings that we have had in trying to improve the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

I also want to particularly mention two of the Members on our side of the aisle, Mr. *Gilchrest* and Mr. *Saxton*, who worked extremely hard in trying to craft a bill that would fit with the concerns and needs of their constituency. As well as that, Chairman *Don Young*, former chairman of this committee, chairman of the Transportation Committee, obviously has always put a great deal of effort and work into fisheries issues, and his work will continue into the future in trying to improve this law.

But I want to thank Mr. *Rahall* for all the work not just on this legislation but all the work that he has done over the last 4 years. It has been a great experience for me having an opportunity to work with him. Over the last 4 years, I believe that we have passed more legislation out of the Resources Committee than all the rest of the committees combined. And during that time period we had one bill that went through on a party-line vote, and other than that we were able to work out bipartisan compromises on everything. He and I didn't agree every single time, but we were able to work out something so that we had a bipartisan bill moving, and I appreciate all that he did as my ranking member and I wish him nothing but luck in the future.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I was going to wait until the very end to respond, but I want to say to the gentleman from California (Mr. *Pombo*), the distinguished chairman of the House Resources Committee, that it has truly been an honor to work with him during his tenure as chairman of our committee. The gentleman has fought hard for those principles that he has believed in. He has accomplished a great deal during his tenure here. I commend him for his tenacity, and he truly has been a fighter for that which he believes. As he has said, we have not agreed on every issue, but we have had our respectful disagreements and we have worked in good faith as well. I believe we have during his tenure as chairman.

I do welcome the incoming ranking member, Mr. *Young*. I have served on both the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the Resources Committee for my entire tenure in this body. Thirty years we have worked

together, and now I am glad to have him as the ranking member on my committee and may he stay that way for a long, long time.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. *Pallone*), who has been a true leader on this issue and fought very hard for this legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank our ranking member, Mr. *Rahall*, for all his contributions in getting this to the floor this evening. I know it was not easy to get us here to achieve the consensus that we have tonight. I would also like to thank on the other side of the aisle obviously our chairman, Mr. *Pombo*, and Mr. *Young* as well. I know this will be the last day, I guess, that we have this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, but I want to say that throughout your tenure as the chairman of the Resources Committee, I could always count on you to be honest and forthright about everything. And even though oftentimes we did disagree, there were many times when we agreed on different matters. So I want to thank you for your tenure and obviously look forward also to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. *Young*) as our ranking member. He is another person who speaks his mind and certainly manages to get things done.

I want to support this legislation. I think that it is a very important and comprehensive bill that updates our Nation's fisheries management laws, but I want to mention two provisions that are critically important to my constituents in New Jersey at the Jersey shore. First, it includes legislative discretion allowing the Secretary of Commerce to extend the rebuilding time frame for summer flounder. I, along with many of my colleagues from New Jersey, particularly Mr. *Saxton*, strongly believe that existing law gives NMFS the administrative flexibility to avoid making drastic cuts in next year's summer flounder quota, but the service consistently refused to use that flexibility. We are thus granting a legislative extension of the rebuilding time frame to force the administration to take action and avert drastically low quotas for this important fishery. While the resulting quotas will still be the lowest ever, this language will avoid a dramatically low quota that could have resulted in a virtual shutdown of the entire fishery.

I am also glad to see that this bill contains a provision intended to improve data collection from the recreational sector. Anglers in my district have long known that the MRFSS system is widely inaccurate in estimating recreational landings and is completely inappropriate for use in stock allocation decisions. The language in this bill will help by requiring the secretary to improve the program to ensure accurate data collection and incorporate the results of a recent National Research Council report. I am also glad that the provision prevents a fee from being imposed until at least 2011, preempting an administration proposal to implement a license that could have cost up to \$35 annually for the right to fish.

I will acknowledge that the overall bill is far from perfect. There are provisions in here that I am not completely happy with. And there are other items I would have liked to include. But I know that neither the fishing nor the environmental community are completely happy with every single word, and probably that means it is a very good bill.

This bill does represent an overall improvement in the management of our Nation's fisheries and strikes a balance between conserving stocks and ensuring productive fisheries. It is my fervent hope that this bill will bring some greater sense into a fisheries management system that to the average angler seems confusing at best and completely irrational at worst. We here in Congress have a duty to closely examine the outcomes of this law and closely oversee its implementation by the administration.

Again, I thank all my colleagues and particularly our chairman and ranking member.

I forgot to mention the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. *Gilchrest*), and I apologize, for all your work in putting this together. Thanks again, too, **WAYNE**.

Mr. GILCHREST. Thank you, Mr. *Pallone*.

I want to yield now to the part of the country that has the largest fishery, to Congressman **DON YOUNG**.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Everybody has been thanked on the floor. I double that.

This is a good piece of legislation. It has been a long time coming. I want to thank the ranking member, of course, Mr. *Gilchrest* and Mr. *Oberstar*, and the chairman. This bill will do good for our oceans and for our fisheries. Although it is far from being perfect, we expect to have this finalized tonight and, as has been mentioned before, because it originated in Alaska, the 200-mile limit, the Magnuson-Stevens Act, we will continue to work to improve it. Because it is very, very important that we keep our fisheries sustainable and also to make sure that our oceans are not only protected and conserved but provide the food that is necessary for this Nation of ours.

Again, a lot of work was done, but I can tell you frankly it was the staff on both sides of the aisle, especially on this side, as has already been mentioned. Dave Whaley, who actually used to have hair before he started working on this bill. He doesn't have it anymore. Bonnie Bruce. She is still, I think, relatively attractive and she has been through agony for all types of activity to get this bill done.

I again thank the people that understand the importance and the staff does the majority of work on this. We did do it. The Senate side did it. Now it is the House side's turn to do what is right for the oceans.

- [Begin Insert]

Mr. Speaker, while I support this legislation, there are several provisions which need further explanation.

Section 107 provides that the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Regional Councils and the Council on Environmental Policy, shall revise the procedures for compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act. Those procedures shall integrate NEPA's environmental analytical procedures with the procedures for preparing and approving fishery management plans and amendments under the Magnuson-Stevens Act and shall conform the timelines for NEPA compliance with the timelines for the approval of fishery management plans and amendments established under the Magnuson-Stevens Act. The only way those requirements can be met for plans developed by a Council is to use the Council's plan development processes. That means NEPA procedures must be integrated into the Council process which will be the vehicle for identifying the problem to be addressed, identifying the reasonable alternatives to address that problem, identifying the preferred alternative, and examining the environmental consequences, positive and negative, of the preferred alternative and the reasonable alternatives. After the Council completes its processes, the Secretary will have the final responsibility for determining if NEPA has been complied with and may disapprove the plan, plan amendment, or regulation pursuant to section 304(a)(3) of this act.

In addition, there are a number of provisions in this legislation which deal with the, amount and type of information which needs to be submitted to the Secretary by a variety of entities and how that information is to be treated by the Secretary. It is important that proprietary information, confidential economic information, personal information such as tax forms, and other sensitive information be maintained in a manner which does not compromise an individual or a company's reasonable expectation for privacy. The Secretary must develop regulations for the use and the protection of such information which weighs the need for the information for management purposes with a reasonable person's expectation for privacy.

I am also concerned that the provision requiring that harvest levels be set to prevent overfishing not be interpreted to shut down entire fisheries if one stock of a multi-species complex is experiencing overfishing. The purpose of the act is to provide a healthy fishery resource, but it is also to promote commercial and recreational fishing and support communities dependent on the fishery resources. The act should not be used as a tool for stopping all fishing activities in U.S. waters. The keys to achieving these goals are balance, flexibility, and common sense by the fishery managers. The

provisions dealing with ending overfishing, rebuilding overfished fisheries, and setting harvest levels to prevent overfishing all need to be taken in the context of the National Standards and need to be viewed with an eye toward balance, flexibility, and common sense.

- [End Insert]

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. *DeFazio*), a valued member of our committee.

Mr. *DeFAZIO*. I would first like to engage the ranking member in a colloquy.

The bill requires the Pacific Council to develop a rationalization program within 24 months from date of enactment. The Pacific Council has been working on a comprehensive ground fisheries management program for more than 3 years and is on target to complete that process by 2008. As I understand the bill, the Pacific Council can continue the development of its groundfish management program without having to restart the process. Is that correct?

Mr. RAHALL. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. *DeFAZIO*. I would yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RAHALL. The gentleman from Oregon is entirely correct. It is my understanding that the bill would permit the Pacific Council process to continue. We recognize that the Pacific Council has made substantial progress and do not intend to disrupt their efforts to develop and implement an appropriate groundfish management program, consistent with this act.

Mr. *DeFAZIO*. I thank the gentleman.

Reclaiming my time, there is also another provision in this bill which is long overdue. We have had extraordinary closures of the salmon season on the west coast this year, despite the fact that there are quite a number of plentiful runs of salmon, because one run, the Klamath River, is very, very unhealthy. Over the last 5 years, this administration has done nothing to begin to improve the health of the river. This legislation will begin some of the mitigation restoration activities to restore the health of that fishery which is critical so that we can begin to continue to harvest other salmon species which are more plentiful and not in trouble.

For that and a number of other provisions in the bill, I am very supportive of the legislation.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. *Frank*).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a colloquy.

One of the key provisions in this is the requirement that the Regional Fishery Management Councils develop annual catch limits based on the Science and Statistical Committees. This annual catch limit provision has the potential to contribute in important ways to the process of improving science. But it is vital that in analyzing the options and preparing recommendations, the committees consider a wide range of scientific opinion to ensure that the management plans that are based on their work represent the best possible scientific understanding of the current state of the relevant fisheries as well as projections for the future.

Is it the ranking member's, soon to be chairman's, understanding that the Science and Statistical Committees will in fulfilling their role under this legislation consider this broad array of scientific opinion and sources?

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RAHALL. I appreciate the gentleman's question. I would say that he is entirely correct. In order to help ensure that affected stakeholders have the maximum degree of confidence in the management measures developed by the councils and that those measures are as effective as possible, it is vital that the Science and Statistical Committees operate in an open manner that is receptive to a full spectrum of scientific opinion. Accordingly, it is our expectation that under this legislation, the Science and Statistical Committees would gather information and prepare recommendations in a way that takes into account the research and expertise of a wide range of scientists.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for this and I thank him for also inserting a provision that would make sure that if there is a referendum on quotas that the working fishermen, not just the permit owners, could vote in our region.

But having said that, I want to say that rarely have I seen such a distinguished and thoughtful and intelligent group of my colleagues get something kind of wrong. Let me emphasize it in this way. We heard how there is a special provision here for flounder, where summer flounder are concerned, then there can be flexibility in rebuilding. And I have to ask the question, why is it not the case that what is sauce for the cod is sauce for the flounder? When did the flounder become the exalted species? And if you really, Mr. Speaker, believed in the principles of this legislation, why have

you floundered in applying this uniformly? Why did you make this exception for the flounder?

The problem is partly procedure. This bill was developed mostly in the Senate. I appreciate the good work of the chairman of the committee, Mr. *Pombo*. He and his staff, Mr. Whaley, worked very hard with us to get this kind of flexibility for all species. And Peter Kovar of my staff worked very hard on it and we had frankly, I thought, a pretty good bill coming out of the House. Then the election came, and I understand that it had consequences, and we are winding up with the Senate bill plus an exception for flounder.

I don't object to the exception for flounder. I object to the fact that it is an exception. And I hope I will hear at some point why the flexibility in rebuilding flounder makes sense when no other flexibility for any other species is involved.

I will make a prediction, Mr. Speaker. Let me say in this, I believe that we have here an overreaction and that many of my environmentalist friends have an inability, an unwillingness to recognize that some of the hardest-working, most dedicated, practical environmentalists in this country, the fishermen, people whose commitment to the environment is whole because that is their livelihood, that their legitimate concerns have not been fully recognized.

I look forward to working in some other areas in health and safety, but I will make a prediction. The rigidity in this bill for everything but flounder is going to cause problems in the future. I will give the sponsors of this bill one kudo. I don't know if you can have a singular of kudos, but I will give you one kudo. The precedent you have set with the flexibility for flounder will in fact be extended to other species. There is no logical reason for that and I believe experience will soon persuade you of that.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. *Wu*).

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in strong support of the legislation, not on behalf of the flounder but because of the salmon. This year the Federal Government imposed a radical reduction in sport salmon fishing and an effective closing of the salmon fishing season on most of the west coast. The purported reason was to restore the fall Chinook run in the Klamath River system. However, NOAA scientists have admitted that water mismanagement and environmental degradation of the Klamath River system, not ocean fishing, are the causes of Klamath fall Chinook salmon decline. Radically reducing sport salmon fishing and effectively closing commercial salmon fishing is bad public policy, extorts a high price from coastal communities, and did not solve the problem. In our coastal communities, every job lost on the water results in the loss of three jobs on dry land.

Estimates of the economic impact are in the millions. All of this sacrifice with no benefit to the fall Chinook is an ineffective Band-Aid for bad public policy in the Klamath River system.

Most importantly, this administration is attacking the cultural roots of the Pacific Northwest. By effectively closing the salmon fishery, the administration is not just terminating an economy, it is ending a way of life. Fishing for salmon is an integral part of who we are. Under previously imposed fishing restrictions, folks who fish for salmon have made innumerable changes and sacrifices to restore the salmon runs. This administration owes it to these fishermen and their families to provide the disaster assistance that they have promised.

When Klamath Basin farmers needed assistance in 2001, this administration correctly declared a disaster and assistance was appropriated within weeks. Oregon salmon fishermen and their families deserve the same. Finally, tonight, months after west coast families were hit so hard by the salmon closure, we take another important step toward appropriate relief in this bill.

This bill provides that affected offshore fishermen and onshore workers are eligible to receive direct assistance under section 312(a) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act and directs the Secretary of Commerce to provide the assistance. On behalf of west coast fishing families affected by bad Federal policy, I ask you all to support this bill.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. *Farr*).

Mr. FARR. I would just like to thank everybody who has worked on this bill and why, a lot of people have spoken on it, it is late at night, I know people would like to get on with the rest of the agenda for tonight. Put it in this perspective, this is the farm bill for the ocean. Next year we will spend a lot of time, an awful lot of time discussing the farm bill.

What has come here is a 10-year effort since the last reauthorization, Magnuson-Stevens, to really pull all factors together. I think a body that is sitting and watching this tonight who ought to be thanked is the sea grant fellows who have come and spent a year here in the Congress who as doctorates and master's degrees in marine fisheries and marine sciences have helped a lot with this bill.

I would particularly like to thank Letice Houser, who is spending her last week here in Congress as a sea grant fellow, and to all of the Members who have worked so hard. It is a good bill, and I hope it gets implemented in a very effective way to help fisheries in a responsible manner in the future.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. *Allen*).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4956, the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Reauthorization Act of 2006. This bipartisan legislation is the product of tireless negotiations over the last year. The bill will sustain both the fish stocks and our fishing communities. I was proud to work so closely with our ranking member, **NICK RAHALL**, on this particular legislation, to strengthen key conservation provisions and also to protect our fishing communities from excessive consolidation of the fishing industry.

I do care deeply about the Limited Access Privilege Program, or LAPPs. These programs are market-based management tools that allocate percentages of the annual catch's quota shares among fishermen. LAPPs can be a legitimate fisheries management tool, but without strong Federal standards, they privatize the public resources by granting shares of the fishery in perpetuity. Moreover, in the drive toward industry efficiency, they can cause excessive and inequitable consolidation at the expense of small-scale fishermen.

For the past 3 years I have been advocating for a LAPPs legislation that would protect public ownership of the fishery and ensure that managers and program participants are held accountable for program success, while still allowing LAPPs to be used.

This bill reaches that result. The bill includes a 10-year renewable term limit on quota shares granted under a LAPP. This will also protect smaller fishermen by keeping quota prices affordable.

Maine has a fishing industry that is hundreds of years old. It is part of a heritage that defines our State and makes our State a special place.

Maine fishermen want policies that not only allow them to catch fish today but also ensure a long-term sustainable fishery so that they can pass their way of life on to their children and their grandchildren. Maine fishermen and fishermen throughout the Nation need policies in place that ensure a level playing field that give them economic certainty and protect the fish stocks.

This bill serves those ends, and I am proud to support it. I do want to thank Mr. *Rahall* for his leadership and support; and his staff, Jim Zoia, Jeff Petrich, Lori Sonken, and Charlotte Stevenson, have been terrific to work with and deserve great praise. I also want to thank my friends **GEORGE MILLER, BILL DELAHUNT** and **SAM FARR** for their support.

Thanks also to Chairman *Pombo* and his staff for their work on this bill, as well as the work done by Senators **STEVENS, INOUE**, and especially my Maine colleague, Senator *Snowe*, and their respective staffs.

Finally, I do want to thank Emily Knight, my sea grant fellow, for her enthusiasm and hard work on this bill; and Jim Bradley, my legislative director, who oversaw the negotiation so effectively.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. *Walden*).

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland, especially the gentleman from California, for their great work on many pieces of legislation before this body.

Mr. Speaker, I represent a large part of the Klamath Basin, and indeed it has been plagued with enormous problems over many years, literally dating back far before this administration. But it has been pointed out a couple of times on this House floor that it hasn't done anything in Klamath Basin, and I would argue that is simply, factually, an error.

In fact, after the water cutoff of April 6, 2001, this administration, barely a few months into office, got involved in this basin in an unprecedented way to try to bring different partners together to try to find solutions, and there is a lot of work that has been done to improve water quality, to improve irrigation standards, to put more water in the river, to make a fish passage improve, up and down the whole river system.

There is also an enormous amount of other work that needs to be done. There is a very cooperative, very, frankly, exciting group meeting together right now, probably as we speak, trying to come up with a comprehensive solution that involves the tribes, the farmers, environmentalists, power companies, everybody involved in this basin.

This administration, this Congress, put forth \$10 million to screen the "A" canal so that sucker larvae could come back into Klamath Lake; 100,000 acre feet of water was put in streams away from agriculture, and a water bank to put more water into this system. We have passed the authority and funding to remove Chiloquin Dam to improve fish passage, the upper end that deals with sucker recovery.

In the farm bill, \$50 million, the only earmark for EQUIP funding, was carved out by this Congress to help in terms of both irrigation efficiency and conservation programs and partnerships between farmers to put more water into the system. There is an enormous effort under way in this basin by this administration, by this administration, and in a bipartisan way by this Congress. We recognize more work needs to be done.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, this concludes debate on our side of the aisle. Again, commending our chairman, Mr. *Pombo*, wishing him the best on whatever avenue he pursues in the future. I know that he will be spending a

great deal of time on the ranch with his lovely wife, Annette. I wish him Godspeed there.

I thank Mr. *Gilcrest* for his work on this legislation, those that have spoken on it for the help they have been, especially, as I started out my remarks, I thank Senator *Stevens* and Senator *Inouye* who truly extended the olive branch that broke the logjam on this legislation.

As Mr. *Allen* has already done, I also want to recognize our committee Democratic staff who helped make this bill possible. Chief among them is Lori Sonken, as well as Jeff Petrich and Charlotte Stevenson.

I thank Mr. *Pombo's* staff as well. His staff has put in numerous hours on this over a long, long period of time. Without their work we would not be here today celebrating the passage of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GILCREST. I want to thank Mr. *Rahall* and his staff and the Members on that side of the aisle, and Mr. *Pombo* for his effort, Mr. *Young*, and Mr. Jim Saxton, and certainly the staff behind me for all their work.

This is not a perfect bill. There is no utopia in the legislative process. Through consensus and dialogue, we have tried to integrate the ideas of the Members, and we feel very strongly that we have come up with a bill that will improve, sustain and restore the ecology of the Nation's oceans.

I urge my colleagues for an ``aye" vote on this legislation.

- [Begin Insert]

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5946, a bill to reauthorize the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. This bill will improve the management of our nation's fishery resources, and help ensure that we have a sustainable supply of seafood for Americans. Importantly, the new bill would permit regional fishery councils to implement market-based management programs for fisheries that will improve the economics of fishing and enhance the safety of our fishing fleets.

I am also pleased that the new legislation would not disrupt the ongoing efforts by the Pacific Fishery Management Council to improve the management of its groundfish fisheries. The Pacific Council is working diligently to develop a rationalization program for its groundfish fisheries. This process has been underway for more than 3 years, and is nearing completion. While the bill requires the Pacific Council to implement an appropriate groundfish management program within 24 months from the

date of enactment, and to meet other requirements in the new law, it does not require the Pacific Council to begin anew in developing that program.

I would like to thank Chairman **POMBO** and Ranking Member **RAHALL** for their efforts on this bill, and for their willingness to work with us on issues of importance to our Pacific Northwest fisheries.

- [End Insert]

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. *Gilchrest*) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 5946.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.